

Subject:
Meeting Announcement
Area-Wide Soil Contamination Work Group 2 –
Technical Memo & May 6 Draft Agenda

Area-Wide Soil Contamination Work Group 2 Meeting:
Monday, May 6, from 9:30 to 1:00 at the Northwest Region Office of
Ecology.

We plan to discuss the technical memorandum at that meeting. We would also welcome written or oral comments on the technical memorandum either before or after the meeting (until May 15). Send comments to either Kris Hendrickson or Dave Bradley.

The first two steps in the process of evaluating and recommending remedies for sites with low-to-moderate soil concentrations of arsenic and/or lead are (1) identifying the categories of sites at which such contamination may be present and (2) identifying remedial action technologies that may be applicable for remediation of that contamination.

Site Categories: Site categories were selected to group sites into a reasonable number of categories for which remedies may be developed while still allowing for consideration of factors important in remedy evaluation.

Actual sites should fit clearly into one of the site categories. At the May 6th meeting, we would like to get your comments on the following:

- * Is it reasonable to use land use (e.g. potential for child exposure) and development status as the main criteria for identifying site categories?

If not, what changes would you recommend?

- * Are the three site categories identified in the draft memorandum reasonable to frame the evaluation? If not, what changes would you recommend?

Remedial Alternatives: Potentially applicable remedial action technologies were identified using the information survey results. Technologies were screened for their applicability to area-wide soil contamination. Each of the remedial action technologies is briefly described in the technical memorandum and its status as retained or not retained for further evaluation is identified. At the May 6th meeting, we would like to get your comments on the following:

* Is an appropriate range of remedial alternatives identified in the draft memorandum? If not, what alternatives would you recommend being added to (or subtracted from) the list?

The next steps in the remedy selection process include, for each site category, development of remedial action alternatives that include one or more of the identified remedial action technologies, estimation of costs for implementing each remedial action alternative, and evaluation of residual risk associated with each remedial action alternative. Issue papers providing the cost estimates and risk evaluations are planned to be provided to Work Group 2 in early June. After discussion of the cost and risk evaluation issue papers, the remedial action alternatives will be evaluated using the MTCA evaluation criteria, and one or more of the alternatives are likely to be identified as recommended permanent remedies for each site category. Other remedial action alternatives may also be identified as recommended interim remedies.